

A
BRIEF SKETCH
 OF THE
TRIAL
 OF
WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON,
 FOR AN ALLEGED
LIBEL ON FRANCIS TODD,
 OF MASSACHUSETTS.

It is a trite remark, that whatever relates to the freedom of the press, is intimately connected with the rights of the people. Every new prosecution for libel, therefore, (however insignificant in itself,) may be viewed as a test, how far that freedom has been restricted by power on the one hand, or perverted by licentiousness on the other.

In France, the press, at various times, has been subjected to the most despotic and malignant censorship, but it has flourished in defiance of tyranny. In a multitude of libellous cases, the publishers of newspapers have almost invariably suffered punishment; yet the people have as promptly reversed the judgment, and given a triumphant acquittal. At the present moment, the spirit of the French periodicals is eminently republican: it discourses upon the usurpations of the crown, in a style not unworthy of our own revolution, and breathes as freely as in any country on the globe: yea, in the majesty of its strength, it threatens to tread sceptre and throne in the dust.

It is notorious, that the whole judicial power of England has been directed against the liberty of the press, from Tresilian and Jeffereys, down to the present day. But the struggle has long since ceased to be doubtful. Public opinion has broken every fetter, and prosecutions for libels are now anomalies in law. Perhaps it would not be extravagant to say, that many an English editor, who is suffered to print unmolested, *would be covered with indictments* in this "land of the free and home of the brave."

It is true, prosecutions of editors have been comparatively few in this country, from the republican nature of our government, the equity of our laws, and the rights secured to the press by the constitution. Yet whoever has carefully observed the bias given to these cases, must have seen a growing tendency in many of the courts, to stifle free inquiry; to dishearten every effort of reform, and to intimidate the conductors of newspapers. I know not whether there be any thing inherent in the office of judge that is hostile to liberty; but of this I am sure, that some of our judges do not entertain an ardent friendship for the press. Possibly this hostility arises from a prudent selfishness—at least, in numerous instances. By denying our right to investigate public measures, or to interrogate men in their official or private capacity, they hope to raise themselves above responsibility and suspicion. Indeed, even now it is almost impos-

sible to impeach any one of their number, though his guilt be as obvious as the sun in heaven.

The following remarks of Junius, addressed to Lord Mansfield, it is to be feared are becoming more and more applicable to our remissness as a people:

"Men are willing enough to take the law upon trust. They rely on the authority of the judges, because they are too indolent to search for information: or, conceiving that there is some mystery in the laws of their country, which lawyers are only qualified to explain, they distrust their judgment, and voluntarily renounce the right of thinking for themselves."

I would therefore invite the attention of the public, and of editors generally, to the following case of libel, as containing much instruction and interest, as highly illustrative of Maryland justice, (as administered by Nicholas Brice,) and as showing to what extent the liberty of the press is enjoyed in this State. Whether we consider the cause of complaint, or the ground upon which a verdict of guilty was given, the case is calculated to excite surprise, disgust and indignation.

The Baltimore presses are celebrated for their craven spirit, their abject servility, their cormorant selfishness, their stagnant quiescence. The loss of an advertisement, or the withdrawal of a subscriber, is of far greater consequence than the exposure of corruption, or the reform of abuses. In which of the city papers can an intelligent censor gain admittance, if his strictures apply to any thing that exists in the city, county or state? Yet, since the result of my trial, I ought not to marvel that they carry the fear of his honor judge Brice before their eyes! or that they think "the better part of valor is discretion!"

I regret that I could procure no competent stenographer to report this trial. I can only therefore give the facts appertaining thereto, and some hasty comments upon the proceedings, leaving the public to decide how far the determination of the court comports with the creed of the American people, the liberty of the press, or the strict letter of the law.

In the *Genius of Universal Emancipation*, for November 20, 1829, the following article was published under the head of *Black List*. Its insertion, in an undivided form, is necessary, in order that my readers may the better judge of the defectiveness of the indictment.

THE SHIP FRANCIS.

This ship, as I mentioned in our last number, sailed a few weeks since from this port with a cargo of slaves for the New-Orleans market. I do not repeat the fact because it is a rare instance of domestic piracy, or because the case was attended with extraordinary circumstances; for the horrible traffic is briskly carried on, and the transportation was effected in the ordinary manner. I morely wish to illustrate New-England humanity and morality. I am resolved to cover with thick infamy all who were concerned in this nefarious business.

I have stated that the ship Francis hails from my native place, Newburyport, (Massachusetts,) is commanded by a yankee captain, and owned by a townsman named FRANCIS TODD.

Of captain Nicholas Brown I should have expected better conduct. It is no worse to fit out piratical cruisers, or to engage in the foreign slave trade, than to pursue a similar trade along our own coasts; and the men who have the wickedness to participate therein, for the purpose of heaping up wealth, should be **SENTENCED TO SOLITARY CONFINEMENT FOR LIFE;** *they are the enemies of their own species--highway robbers and murderers; and their final doom will be, unless they speedily repent, to occupy the lowest depths of perdition.* I know that our laws make a distinction in this matter. I know that the man who is allowed to freight his vessel with slaves at home, for a distant market, would be thought worthy of death if he should take a similar freight on the coast of Africa; but I know, too, that this distinction is absurd, and at war with the common sense of mankind, and that God and good men regard it with abhorrence.

I recollect that it was always a mystery in Newburyport how Mr. Todd contrived to make profitable voyages to New-Orleans and other places, when other merchants,

with as fair an opportunity to make money, and sending at the same ports at the same time, invariably made fewer successful speculations. The mystery seems to be unravelled. Any man can gather up riches, if he does not care by what means they are obtained.

The *Francis* carried off *seventy-five* slaves, chained in a narrow space between decks. Captain Brown originally intended to take *one hundred and fifty* of these unfortunate creatures; but another hard-hearted shipmaster underbid him in the price of passage for the remaining moiety. Captain B., I believe, is a mason. Where was his charity or brotherly kindness?

I respectfully request the editor of the Newburyport Herald to copy this article, or publish a statement of the facts contained herein—not for the purpose of giving information to Mr. Todd, for I shall send him a copy of this number, but in order to enlighten the public mind in that quarter.—G.

The information contained in the above article, (i. e. so much of it as relates to the transportation of the slaves,) was derived, *indirectly*, from captain Brown, and the mate of the *Francis*—*the latter a son of Mr. Todd*; and *directly*, from a young gentleman who went as passenger in the vessel to New-Orleans, and who expressed some fears of an insurrection on board, but whose testimony I could not obtain in season to produce at my trial. I sent a copy of the paper to Mr. Todd, according to my promise. Instead of vindicating his conduct in the columns of the *Genius*, and endeavoring to show that my statement was materially false, he entered a civil action against me for injuring “his good name, fame and reputation,” by publishing “wicked, scandalous and malicious matter” in relation to himself; estimating damages at five thousand dollars. This action remains undecided.

Next came the following presentment from the Grand Jury:

BALTIMORE CITY COURT, FEBRUARY TERM, 1830.

The Grand Jurors of the State of Maryland, for the body of the City of Baltimore, on their oaths do present, that Benjamin Lundy and William Lloyd Garrison did, in a certain newspaper printed and published in the City of Baltimore, on the 20th day of November last, called the *Genius of Universal Emancipation*, publish a gross and malicious libel against Francis Todd and Nicholas Brown.

H. W. EVANS, Foreman.

Witnesses,

Henry Thompson,

John W. Thompson.

True Copy from the original Presentment.

Test,

WM. MEDCALF, Clerk
Baltimore city Court.

Accordingly, an action was entered by the State of Maryland, against the editors of the *Genius of Universal Emancipation*. The indictment ran thus:

STATE OF MARYLAND—*City of Baltimore*, TO WIT:

The Jurors of the State of Maryland, for the body of Baltimore, do on their oaths present, that Benjamin Lundy, late of the city aforesaid, yeoman, and William Lloyd Garrison, also late of the city aforesaid, yeoman, contriving and unlawfully, wickedly, and maliciously intending, to hurt, injure and vilify one Francis Todd, and to deprive him of his good name, fame and reputation, and to bring him into great contempt, scandal, infamy, and disgrace, on the twentieth day of November, in the year eighteen hundred and twenty-nine, with force and arms, at the city aforesaid, unlawfully, wickedly and maliciously, did print and publish, and cause and procure to be printed and published, in a certain newspaper, then and there entitled the “*Genius of Universal Emancipation*,” a certain communication, under the head of “*Black List*”—“*Horrible News, Domestic and Foreign*,” and to which communication the letter “*G.*” was then and there appended, as and for a signature, and which letter referred to some person to the Jurors aforesaid unknown, of and concerning the said Francis Todd, and of and concerning him the said Francis Todd (amongst others) engaged in the Transportation of Slaves from the port of Baltimore to the port of New-Orleans, being therefore to be regarded and considered as an enemy to his own species, a highway robber and a murderer, and which communication then and there contained the false, scandalous, and malicious matter and libel following, that is to say: “*The ship Francis. This ship, as I,*” (meaning the said person referred to by the said letter G.) “mentioned in our last

number, sailed a few weeks since from this port," (meaning the port of Baltimore) "with a cargo of slaves for the New-Orleans market. I," (still meaning the said person referred to by the said letter G.) "do not repeat the fact because it is a rare instance of domestic piracy, or because the case was attended with extraordinary circumstances; for the horrible traffic is briskly carried on, and the transportation was effected in the ordinary manner. I" (still meaning the said person referred to by the said letter G.) "merely wish to illustrate New-England humanity and morality. I" (again meaning the said person referred to by the said letter G.) "am resolved to cover with thick infamy all" (meaning amongst others the said Francis Todd) "who were concerned in this nefarious business." (Thereby meaning the transportation of slaves from the Port of Baltimore to the Port of New-Orleans.) "I" (again meaning the said person referred to by the said letter G.) "have stated that the ship Francis" "hails from my native place, Newburyport, (Massachusetts,) is commanded by a Yankee captain, and owned by a townsman, named Francis Todd. Of captain Nicholas Brown I" (still meaning the person referred to by the letter G.) "should have expected better conduct. It is no worse to fit out piratical cruisers, or to engage in the foreign slave trade, than to pursue a similar trade along our own coasts; and the men who have the wickedness" (meaning that the said Francis Todd, amongst others, had the wickedness) "to participate therein, for the purpose of heaping up wealth, should be sentenced to solitary confinement for life; and they" (meaning the men who had the wickedness to participate in the transportation of slaves along our own coast, and amongst them including the said Francis Todd,) "are the enemies of their own species—highway robbers and murderers"—(meaning that the said Francis Todd was to be regarded as a highway robber and murderer) "and their final doom will be, unless they speedily repent, to occupy the lowest depths of perdition"—to the great scandal, damage and disgrace of the said Francis Todd, to the evil example of all others in like manner offending, and against the peace, government and dignity of the state.

(Signed)

THOMAS JENNINGS & R. W. GILL,
Deputies of the Attorney-General of Maryland, for Baltimore city.

True copy—Test,

WILLIAM MEDCALF, Clerk.

To the foregoing indictment, a plea of *Not Guilty* was made.

The Jury was then sworn. Witnesses for the State, Henry Thompson, E. K. Deaver, James Lucas, and the Pilot of the Francis.

Counsel for the Prosecution, Jonathan Meredith, Esq. and R. W. Gill, Esq. For the Defendant, Charles Mitchell, Esq.

The libellous matter, (so called,) so far as contained in the indictment, was then read, and the whole article (containing *other matter than that embraced in the indictment*,) was offered to be read to the Jury, in order to show a malicious intent.

The Counsel for the Defendant objected to this course, inasmuch as no one was compelled to defend himself against charges *not set forth* in an indictment; otherwise, why so much precision and formality required in the drawing of this instrument? Further, that the Jury might unconsciously derive their impressions of guilt from other passages than those contained in the indictment, which would unquestionably be illegal, if predicated on any *facts* as stated in those other passages. Hence the caution observed by courts in permitting such extraneous matter to go to the Jury. He cited several authorities to show, that, in all analogous cases, the *Defendant* was permitted to read material and qualifying parts of the same publication, though not embraced in the indictment; but he challenged the court to cite a single authority, or show a single precedent in the practices of the English or American courts, that, gave such liberty to the *Plaintiff*. He would not say, whether or not the remaining moiety of the article, relative to Mr. Todd, was libellous. Whenever an indictment should be framed upon it, he was ready to argue that point. Suppose that a man is indicted for grand larceny, and that the evidence in court, failing to convict him, the plaintiff (in order to show that the prisoner is bad enough to commit a theft,) undertakes to prove that on the same night he committed murder? Would not such a course be as ex-

traordinary as irrelevant? The indictment before then contained no libel upon Francis Todd. Upon that indictment alone, the Defendant was to receive a verdict of acquittal or condemnation. He concluded (after a long and learned argument) by protesting against the reading of the whole article, and praying the court to pause ere it allowed such a strange and unwarrantable procedure.

These objections were overruled by the court, who contended that the right of the plaintiff to read extraneous and corroborative matter was as ample as the defendant's. *The whole paper* (signed "G.") *was then read by the Prosecutor, to prove the malicious intent of the writer!!!*

Henry Thompson was sworn. He had acted as agent for Mr. Todd many years, and knew him to be an estimable man. He [Thompson] contracted for the transportation of the slaves, before consulting Mr. Todd, but immediately wrote to him, stating the conditions on which the contract was made. Mr. Todd, in reply, said he should have preferred another kind of freight; but as freights were dull, times hard, and money scarce, he was satisfied with the bargain [!!!] Articles necessary for the comfort and convenience of the slaves were put on board the vessel. The slaves were purchased by a planter of New Orleans, named Millighan, of whom Thompson (and also his honor Judge Nicholas Brice) spoke in warm panegyrics. He said Captain Brown was a humane man, and had no doubt that the slaves were treated kindly on the passage.

The Pilot of the Francis testified, that the slaves were received on board at Annapolis—eighty-eight in number—consisting of men, women and children; that they were not confined, but suffered to peregrinate about the ship, *ad libitum*; that they enjoyed the extatics of bliss, and were delighted at the prospect of realising the pleasures of interminable slavery; that they were provided with shoes, hats, trowsers, petticoats, &c. &c.; and that Captain Brown was the best of ship-masters.*

E. K. Deaver was sworn. He had no great relish for law-suits, and did not wish to be put to the torture of a cross-fire. Could not swear that he printed that identical number of the Genius of Universal Emancipation. He was not bound to answer interrogatives, and therefore believed it safe not to do so.

James Lucas was sworn. He felt all the embarrassment of his partner. Was certain, however, that they did print this particular paper, and that he [Lucas] delivered it to Henry Thompson, jr. Could not say that Mr. Garrison ever saw it, or read or showed it, or any other containing the alleged libel to any person, or that he corrected the proof-sheets thereof; although the editors (Lundy & Garrison) generally corrected the proof sheets of the newspaper.

Here rested the evidence on the part of the State.

Dr. McCulloh, of the Custom House, having been sworn, presented the clearance papers of the Francis, by which it appeared that she cleared early in October last, from the Port of Baltimore for New Orleans, *direct*, with an assorted cargo, but no slaves.

A letter from the Collector of the Port of Annapolis was read, and agreed by counsel to be received as if the Collector had sworn to the facts stated therein—he being unable to give his personal attendance at court. It seems that the Francis sailed down the bay a few miles to a convenient spot, where she took on board the slaves, and got a *new clearance* for New Orleans from the Port of Annapolis. Her slave manifest enumerated *eighty-eight* slaves, (instead of seventy-five, as stated in the Genius of Universal Emancipation,) of different ages, sexes, and conditions.

* The extraordinary zeal which this man evinced in behalf of the prosecutor, drew forth a remark from a spectator, who said in a whisper, that the pilot spoke as if acting under the influence of a ———

No other evidence was offered or deemed necessary on the part of the Defendant, it being admitted that Mr. Todd was the owner of the *Francis*.

The Counsel for the Defendant then rose, and addressed the Jury nearly two hours, in a masterly style. Indignation and shame for the continuance of the accursed traffic in human flesh—sympathy for the poor victims of oppression—love for the cause of universal liberty—kindled his feelings into a blaze. His eloquence “was a torrent that carried every thing before it. He thundered—he lightened.” He termed the law of libel a drain through which had circulated every thing that was putrid, vile, and unseemly. It was the last and most successful engine of tyranny; and had done more to perpetuate public abuses, and to check the march of reform, than any other agent. He showed in what light Congress beheld the slave trade—that, by one of the laws of that body, it was reprobated as piracy upon mankind, and the detection of an American citizen engaged in it on the coast of Africa, would send him to the gallows—that, by another act of Congress, all transportation of slaves from an American port to the West India islands, or to any foreign port, was prohibited under the penalty of confiscation. True, the domestic trade was tolerated; simply because it was beyond the legitimate authority of Congress, and came exclusively under the cognizance of individual states; yet that wise and venerable body, in stamping the seal of infamy upon the former traffic, fixed it as indelibly upon the latter. Distance did not change the principle. It was absurd, it was preposterous, it was wicked to contend, that both were not equally base, abhorrent and disgraceful. He trusted in God that the time was not far distant, when the Legislature would pass a law to that effect: it would be the brightest in the statute books of Maryland. As to the indictment, it was fatally defective in its construction, and contained no libel upon Francis Todd. The matter embraced therein, did not implicate Mr. Todd in the transportation of the slaves, nor charge him with being privy or consenting thereto. It merely stated the fact, that he was the owner of the vessel—nothing more; and could this, by any ingenuity, be tortured into a libel? Yet it had been proved that Mr. Todd participated in the business, though he felt some severe twinges of conscience for so doing. Evidence had entirely failed to convict the Defendant of having printed or published, or of having any agency in printing or publishing, or of having written or caused to be written, the obnoxious article. The postulate assumed by the writer “G.”—that the domestic slave trade is as heinous as the foreign, that it is a war upon the human species, that it is murderous and piratical—was certainly not punishable by law. A multitude of good men entertained a similar opinion; and, unless our country groaned under a thralldom as despotic as that of the Africans, they had a right at any time, publicly or privately, to declare that opinion. It was a general view of the traffic, expressed in general terms. Every Sabbath, the clergy denounced, in no measured language, popular and *legalized* vices—could they also be indicted? He reverted to the extraordinary license which had been given to the prosecutor, to read other parts of the publication not contained in the indictment, in order to obtain a verdict of guilty. It was neither *jure humano* nor *jure divino*. It was taking the Defendant by surprise, by giving him no notice to prepare his evidence of the truth of those parts omitted. He passed some flattering encomiums upon the editors of the *Genius*, and expressed a hope that they would be sustained, not only by the Jury but by their country.

I regret that a defence so learned, eloquent and cogent, cannot be given to the public as it was delivered. I did not take a single note at the trial, and therefore must depend entirely upon my memory. The above

is a mere skeleton of one grand, gigantic whole. The language is mine; but, I believe, the synopsis is substantially correct.

R. W. Gill, Esq. Deputy Attorney for the State, made a few miscellaneous remarks (in reply to Mr. Mitchell) about the legality of the traffic, the rights of slaveholders, the contentment and good condition of the slaves, the fanaticism and virulence of the editors, (L. & G.) and the necessity of putting a wholesome restraint upon the periodical under consideration. The Jury were to read the whole of the piece under the head of "*Black List*," (and he gave them a copy of the *Genius* containing it,) and to judge of the malicious intent of the writer.

His honor, Judge Brice, said that the Jury would acquit or convict upon the matter contained in the indictment; at the same time, they were authorised to derive auxiliary aid, in making up their verdict, from the remainder of the article!!!

The Jury retired, and, in about fifteen minutes, returned with a verdict of *Guilty*.

The Counsel for the Defendant then made a motion in arrest of judgment, and for judgment of acquittal, notwithstanding the verdict, and reasons filed—to wit:

BALTIMORE CITY COURT.

STATE OF M^D. ND,

WILLIAM L. GARRISON.

And now the Defendant prays a new Trial, because the said Verdict is not warranted by the evidence adduced on the part of the State in support of the prosecution; the said evidence being materially variant from the libel set forth in the Indictment, inasmuch as the Indictment professes to set forth the whole communication signed "G." and the paper read in evidence to the Jury, shews that material and qualifying parts of the said communication have not been stated in the Indictment, and the Defendant had no notice to prepare his evidence of the truth of that part omitted.

2d. Because it was proved to the Jury, that Francis Todd, named in said Indictment, is a Citizen of and a resident in the State of Massachusetts, and was not in the State of Maryland when the said publication was made, nor has been in the said State of Maryland since.

3d. Because there was no evidence before the Court and Jury, that the Defendant printed or published, or had any agency in the printing or publishing this identical paper read in evidence to the Jury; but the only evidence was by Lucas & Deaver, that Lundy & Garrison were the proprietors of the Newspaper called the "*Genius of Universal Emancipation*," and that Lucas & Deaver were employed by contract with the proprietors to print that Newspaper so entitled. That they did print this particular paper, and Mr. Lucas delivered it to Mr. Thompson, at Lucas & Deaver's printing office; but neither of the Witnesses knew, or could say, that Mr. Garrison ever saw it, or read or showed it, or any other containing this libel complained of, to any person, or that he corrected the proof sheets thereof, although the Editors (Lundy & Garrison) generally corrected the 'proof' sheets of the Newspaper above mentioned;—all which objections above mentioned were taken before the said verdict was rendered, and entitled the Defendant in Law to the Verdict.

And the Defendant further prays the Court to arrest the Judgment in this case, because the matters charged in the said Indictment do not amount in Law to a Libel upon Francis Todd, punishable by the laws of this State. And also because the Innuendoes set forth in the said Indictment are not warranted by the communication therein set forth, but vary and enlarge the import of the language of that communication.

And also because there is no averment, or colloquium, in the said Indictment, that Francis Todd was the owner of any vessel, in fact, or had fitted out or employed any vessel for the Transportation of Slaves along our coast, or from one part of the United States to another.

And also because the Epithets stated in the said Indictment, taken in connexion with the subject matter, impute no crime to Francis Todd, and reflect no disgrace or scandal on his character, but are mere opinions upon the general nature and moral aspect of the species of traffic there reprobated, which the Defendant had a right to express, as the Proprietor and Editor of a Free Press.

WM. LLOYD GARRISON,

by CH. MITCHELL.

True Copy—Test, WM. MEDCALF, Clerk

Baltimore City Court.

March 1, 1850.

I invite the attention of the public to the foregoing reasons, as putting the case in a plain, intelligible form, as exposing the defectiveness of the indictment and the arbitrary conduct of the court. The motion was overruled; instead of which the court advised another to be made for a new trial. The motions in arrest of judgment, and for a new trial, were powerfully argued by the counsel for the Defendant, but also overruled, and judgment given on the verdict. Sentence \$50 fine, and costs of prosecution.

The facts are before the public. The case, I believe, is important. As for the law (if it be law) which has convicted me, I regard it as a burlesque upon the constitution—as pitiful as it is abhorrent and atrocious. It affords a fresh illustration of the sentiment of an able writer, that *“of all injustice, that is the greatest which goes under the name of Law; and of all sorts of tyranny, the forcing of the letter of the Law against the equity, is the most insupportable.”* Is it supposed by Judge Brice, that his frowns can intimidate me, or his sentence stifle my voice, on the subject of African oppression? He does not know me. So long as a good Providence gives me strength and intellect, I will not cease to declare, that the existence of slavery in this country is a foul reproach to the American name; nor will I hesitate to proclaim the guilt of kidnappers, slave abettors, or slave owners, wheresoever they may reside, or however high they may be exalted. I am only in the *alphabet* of my task; time shall perfect a useful work. It is my shame that I have done so little for the people of color; yea, before God, I feel humbled that my feelings are so cold, and my language so weak. A few white victims must be sacrificed to open the eyes of this nation, and to show the tyranny of our laws. I expect, and am willing to be persecuted, imprisoned and bound, for advocating African rights; and I should deserve to be a slave myself, if I shrunk from that duty or danger.

To show the vindictiveness of the prosecutor, in the present instance, I would state, that, not content with punishing the *author* of the “libellous” article in the *Genius*, he has also brought a suit against my philanthropic friend Lundy, on the same ground. This is a grief to me—not so, however, to him. The court was aware, that he was *out of the State* when I published my strictures upon Mr. Todd, and that he never saw them until they appeared in print—and yet another prosecution!

Deeply as I am indebted to my editorial brethren throughout the country, for their kind expressions toward me, I solicit them to publish the facts growing out of this trial, and to make such comments as may seem expedient. I think it will appear, that the freedom of the press has been invaded, and that power, and not justice, has convicted me; and I appeal to the people for a change of the verdict. Certainly the fact would astonish all Europe, if it were trumpeted in that quarter, that an *American citizen lies incarcerated in prison, for having denounced slavery, and its abettors, in his own country!* WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.

Baltimore Jail, May 1, 1830.

SONNET.

High walls, and huge, the *body* may confine,
And iron grates obstruct the prisoner's gaze,
And massive bolts may baffle his design,
And vigilant keepers watch his devious ways:
Yet scorns th' immortal *mind* this base control!
No chains can bind it, and no cell enclose:
Swifter than light, it flies from pole to pole,
And in a flash from earth to heaven it goes!
It leaps from mount to mount—from vale to vale
It wanders, plucking honeyed fruits and flowers;
It visits home, to hear the fire-side tale,
Or in sweet converse pass the joyous hours.
'Tis up before the sun, roaming afar,
And in its watches wearies every star!

W. L. G.